



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/587,073	04/27/2007	Minoru Ishijima	2006_1179A	6947
513 7590 03/29/2010 WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P. 1030 15th Street, N.W., Suite 400 East Washington, DC 20005-1503				
EXAMINER BINDA, GREGORY JOHN				
ART UNIT 3679		PAPER NUMBER		
NOTIFICATION DATE 03/29/2010		DELIVERY MODE ELECTRONIC		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ddalecki@wenderoth.com
coa@wenderoth.com

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.		Applicant(s)	
	10/587,073		ISHIJIMA ET AL.	
	Examiner		Art Unit	
	Greg Binda		3679	

All Participants:

(1) Greg Binda.

(2) Jeffrey Howell.

Date of Interview: 23 March 2010

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

none

Claims discussed:

none

Prior art documents discussed:

Yamazaki et al, US 2003/0083135

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.

☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

Status of Application: _____

(3) _____

(4) _____

Time: 2:00 pm

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: In response to applicant's argument with regard to the drawing objection at item 3 of the previous Office action, examiner asked applicant to explain the relationship between the instant drawings of the disclosed invention. Applicant explained the view at Fig. 7 is a schematic view of the joint in Fig. 6 observed at the open end of housing 10 and that the ball drawn in dashed line in Fig. 7 equates to the uppermost ball 30 in Fig. 6. Examiner pointed out that a similar such schematic view would be no different for the joint at Yamazaki's Fig. 4.

The description of Fig. 7 at pages 11, lines 4+ includes the term "straight travel state of the vehicle". At examiner's request, applicant explained the term refers to the condition of a vehicle that is being steered in the straight ahead direction. It does not refer to the alignment of the inner and outer joint members of the disclosed invention.